Application No.: 10/786,772

Office Action mailed: January 25, 2007 Reply to Office Action mailed: April 25, 2007

Remarks

This REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION and RESPONSE are in reply to the

Office Action mailed January 25, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Objections and Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, Claims 1-28 were pending in the

Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper

antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 22-28 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-28 were rejected under

35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ali et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,920,607, hereafter Ali).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1-2, 8-9, and 15-16, and cancels Claims 22-28,

leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-21. Reconsideration of the

application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to

prosecute any originally presented claims in a continuing or future application.

III. The Specification

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, the Specification was objected to as failing

to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have

been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification now

provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, and reconsideration thereof is

respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim

the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been

amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the application, as amended,

conforms to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration thereof is

respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01437US1

gcheng /wp/BEAS/1437US1/Reply to 1-25-07 OA.doc

6

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, Claims 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 22-28 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ali.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-based extendable application framework, comprising:

a user interface:

a plurality of services;

a plurality of extensions extending an application;

wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions;

wherein one of the plurality of extensions can expose and consume services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions;

wherein one of the plurality of extensions can provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and

wherein one of the plurality of services can provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment as comprising a plurality of services and a plurality of extensions extending an application, wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions, and wherein one of the plurality of extensions can expose and consume services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01437US1 gcheng /wp/BEAS/1437US1/Reply to 1-25-07 OA.doc

Application No.: 10/786,772

Office Action mailed: January 25, 2007

Reply to Office Action mailed: April 25, 2007

The advantages of the embodiment defined by Claim 1 include that extensions are not

limited to only using services that are associated with it. Instead, extensions can expose to other

extensions the services it is associated with. Furthermore, extensions can consume services

associated with other extensions.

Ali discloses methods and systems for dynamically creating user interfaces. As

disclosed therein, by using independent data files, a user interface can be dynamically modified

by changing the description of the user interface in the data files themselves (col. 6, lines 61-

64). In one embodiment of Ali, an application invokes a XML data file and a browser. The

browser, in response to the execution of the application, loads a base DHTML document, XML

data that contains a namespace navigation link to a file, and the data file. The browser verifies

the XML data format against a XML schema and processes the XML data with a XML template

to render a DHTML document that forms the UI on the display (figure 5). By editing the text in

the XML data, a designer can dynamically modify a UI simply by changing the description of the

UI in the XML data file.

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, Ali was described as disclosing at least

one extension and at least one service because Ali discloses an XML data file and an

application. Thus, it appears from the above description that, in Ali, only a single application and

a single XML data file are disclosed. In contrast, as amended, the embodiment defined by Claim

1 comprises a plurality of services and a plurality of extensions.

Claim 1 has also been amended such that in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, each

one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions, and

one of the plurality of extensions can expose and consume services associated with another

extension of the plurality of extensions. It is respectfully submitted that these features are not

disclosed in Ali.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the

embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited

reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 15

Claims 8 and 15 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments

therein. For reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits

that Claims 8 and 15, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the

8

cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01437US1

gcheng /wp/BEAS/1437US1/Reply to 1-25-07 OA.doc

Application No.: 10/786.772

Office Action mailed: January 25, 2007 Reply to Office Action mailed: April 25, 2007

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are allowable as depending from an allowable

independent claim and further in view of the additional limitations of these claims. Applicant

respectfully submits that Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor

obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It

is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them

patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations

should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 22-28

Claims 22-28 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled

claims in a continuing or future application.

VII. **Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the

subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully

requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist

in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment

to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any

fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 25, 2007

/Guanyao Cheng/ By: ___

Guanyao Cheng

Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 California Street, 14th Floor San Francisco, California 94108

Telephone: (415) 362-3800

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01437US1 gcheng /wp/BEAS/1437US1/Reply to 1-25-07 OA.doc

9